

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. 7041 08/20/2003 Katrina Schmidt 12166 10/644,450 **EXAMINER** 12/05/2005 28484 7590 COONEY, JOHN M BASF AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT CARL-BOSCH STRASSE 38, 67056 LUDWIGSHAFEN PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT LUDWIGSHAFEN, 69056 1711 **GERMANY**

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			yf	
lication No.	Applicant(s)			
644,450	SCHMIDT ET AL.			
miner	Art Unit	<u> </u>		
n m. Cooney	1711			
on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ldress		
SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, DF THIS COMMUNICATION. In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed				
y and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any				
n <u>ber 2005</u> . n is non-final. xcept for formal matters, pro te Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45		e merits is		
ending in the application.				
m consideration.	•			
jected.				
tion requirement.				
accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. ng(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). er. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.				
ty under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).			
e been received. e been received in Application cuments have been received T Rule 17.2(a)). e certified copies not receive	ed in this National	Stage		
4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summan	10/644,450	SCHMIDT ET AL.			
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit		
		John m. Cooney	1711		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	J. nety filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2005.				
· · · —	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	s action is non-final.			
′=	<u> </u>				
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Dispositi	on of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,8-14,16-19,21-31 and 34-44</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) 1-4,6,8-14,16-19,21-31 and 34-44 is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
	•	_			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 August 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
The dath of declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action of form P10-152.					
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment	• •				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date					
Notice of Diabsperson's Patent Diawing Review (FTO-946) Specific Control of Control					
S Patent and Tr		·			

Applicant's arguments filed 9-20-05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

All previous rejections are withdrawn upon further consideration.

The following rejections are set forth as new:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4,6,8-14,16-19,21-31 and 34-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants recite their curing component to be a polyol. However, the supporting disclosure at paragraph [0020] recites species of the invention, Jeffamine T-403 and D-2000, in support of the description of their curing component which are not, in fact, polyols. It is not seen that the invention as is now claim was described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4,6,8-14,16-19,21-31 and 34-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants' claims are confusing as to intent because it can not be determined what the make-up of the curing component is intended to be. The problems are best exemplified by claims 8 and 9 which refer to their compounds as "di- and tri-functional polyols", but all of the functionality is provided by the amino functional groups (i.e. two and three primary amine groups. Additionally, all of the exemplified examples of applicants' curing components are not in fact polyols {i.e. polyoxypropylenetriamine, polyoxypropylenediamine, and Jeffamine T-403 and D-2000}. Correction and clarification is required.

Claims 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 14 is broader than the claim from which it depends in that its high end molecular weight value point is 550, but claim 1's is 500. Claims are confusing as to intent, and appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4,6,8-14,16-19,21-31 and 34-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone (5,006,569) in view of Nodelman et al.(6,586,487).

Stone discloses preparations of polyurethane foams prepared from resin formulations including water blowing agent, isocyanate, polyols having molecular weights within the range of 3500-8000 and hydroxyl values of from 20-100, and reactive additives which meet the curing component values as claimed wherein articles having densities of less than 1 pound per cubic foot are obtained (see column 3 line 63 – column 4 line 1, column 5 lines 46-50, column 6 lines 12-54, column 8 lines 29-41, and Tables 6, 9, and 10).

Stone differs from applicants' claims in that it does not particularly require employment of the crosslinking first polyol of applicants' claims. However, Stone does recognize crosslinkers to be useful in the embodiments of their invention to control and mitigate softening effects in products realized. Further, Nodelman et al. discloses crosslinker polyols meeting the defined criteria of the first polyol component of applicants' claims in the preparation of low-density water blown polyurethane foams for the purpose of imparting their crosslinking effect. Accordingly, it would have been

Application/Control Number: 10/644,450 Page 5

Art Unit: 1711

obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have employed the crosslinkers of Nodelman et al. in the preparations of Stone for purpose of controlling or mitigating softening effects in order to arrive at the products and processes of applicants' claims with the expectation of success in the absence of a showing of new or unexpected results.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Clatty et al. is cited for its disclosure of interesting crosslinkers in the art(column 12 lines 40-43). The Poly-Q and Multranol Spec Disclosures are cited for their relevant info concerning the materials of the instant concern.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Cooney whose telephone number is 571-272-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck, can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JUHN M. COONEY, JR. PRIMARY EXAMINER